IFW

Dr. -Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

phone/fax +49 6126 8949

Registered

Mr. David R. Dunn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3616

10/690,742 "Anti-submarining seat-belt assembly"
Docket No.: G6A4

(E1) My amended application of 03/24/2004, registered on 04/05/2004 by USPTO
(E2) Mrs Draper's OAS (Office Action Summary) of 06/23/2004
(E3) My first amended application of 08/06/2004, registered on 11/22/2004 by USPTO
(E3A) My letter of 08/06/2004 to Mrs. Draper
(E4) Your OAS of 02/25/2005

My 4-page objection (E5) to your OAS (E4) regarding the status and verdict

Dear Mr. Dunn, April 5, 2005

The status of the action (E4) is **not** final, but **non**-final because you have **not yet** responded to Monages' and Tame's drawbacks, listed in (E3), in (E4). Would you please send me your new OAS in **final** status in which you should

1. review them and D13 – D21, mentioned below, as well as outline your objection to each drawback or case;
2. explain why you have violated the US patent rules (D16) by annulling the features of my inventions, while experts, like Mr Gruber from CIPO and myself, consider Monages' and Tame's patents dubious, if not to say worthless! See D1-D21; and
3. explain why your verdict **differs from** those of CIPO, EPO (European Patent Office), PCT and DPMA (German Patent Office) in regard to allowable (patentable) rate of USPTO at over **53 %**, more than 3 times higher than that of EPO, DPMA or, I assume, CIPO? See D19 and D20.

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

In (E4) you have **just** repeated Mrs Draper's claim rejections ref. to (E2) **without**

a) reading (E3A), in which Monages' and Tame's drawbacks are summarized, and

b) taking account of (E3) disclosing

b1) Monages' drawbacks D1 to D12 in pp.4/line 13 to pp.7/line 11 (double space) or pp.3/line 23 to pp.5/line 23 (single space) and

b2) Tame's drawbacks in pp.3/line 23 to pp.4/line 6 (double space) or pp.3/line 1 to 15 (single space).

Tame's drawbacks were already disclosed in my appl. 09/554,463. In addition thereto, Tame's and Monages' inventions are neither feasible nor applicable. Ref. to IIHS' Status Reports Vol. 36 No. 1, Jan. 6, 2001, Vol. 38 No. 7, June 28, 2003 and Vol. 40 No. 2, Jan. 31, 2005 IIHS suggested NHSTA upgrade the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 214 upon legislating a barrier, which, idealizing the height and front bumper and the front section of a pickup or an SUV, intrudes more into the area of struck vehicle than NHSTA's current one and poses greater risk to heads because it is wider and higher.

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

D13: Tame's latch-plate-feeding device, facing the vehicle door, totally deformed in a side crash test, is destroyed, for example, at an intrusion of 1,130 mm when a light-weight AUDI A2 crashed into a far heavier Opel Van Zafira! See "U040205". Would you explain me please how the severely injured passengers can be evacuated?

D14: In contrast to my common release button Tame's latch-plate-feeding device is bulky. When it is installed, the side door box, usually attached to the door's inner panel, must be disassembled. Customers, missing these door boxes and realizing the danger of not being restrained when Tame's devices are destroyed in accidents, would not buy cars equipped therewith.

D15. The lower part of the body of a passenger, facing the vehicle door, totally deformed in a side crash test, is squashed by the inward deflection of lap belt 46 and anti-submarining belt 24, whose ends are fastened to the vehicle floor.

D16: If your "excellent" opinion "...**to modify** Monages with the teachings of Tame to include.." really complies with USPTO's patent rules please issue an official USPTO-statement allowing me

1. **to modify** all my US-applications and new ones with features (teachings) of all alien applications world-wide and all patents world-wide to include all those features in order to facilitate USPTO granting patent in quick mode and to increase the allowable rate (D19) and
2. **to add new matter.** Why have you reminded me in (E4) of **not** adding new matter?

One day you would include the feasible features of my other appls and/or patents, listed below, in junk patents, representing Monages' and Tame's patents, drawbacks and failure, in order to issue claim rejections. Logically, your "excellent" opinion has **violated** the US patent rules.

D17: How can *the combination of* two junk patents that you proposed in contradiction to US-patent rules, be superior to my energy-absorbing, vibration-dampening "Anti-submarining seat-belt assembly" which is capable of ensuring the survival chance of a passenger whether he is skinny, normal or obese or she is wearing trousers, gown etc.? *Please write in detail your solutions to overcome the drawbacks of both junk* patents *and how to make them work. Is it right that your solutions are my inventions in reference to claims? Please write them in your new OAS.*

D18: Why has USPTO granted patent on Monages' inventions which are definitely **junk**? *For sure, DPMA and EPO would never grant patent on Monages' inventions due to infeasibility and inapplicability!*

D19: It is far more difficult to successfully prosecute an application before DPMA and EPO than before USPTO. DPMA or EPO is used to grant award patent on **up to three** out of **20** applications, allowable rate of up to **15 %**, while USPTO has awarded 190,000 patents out of 355,000 applications, allowable rate of over **53 %**, which creates a **quality** problem for US patents themselves and verifies the **correctness** of my verdict on Monages' and Tame's patents! See attached [Economist] disclosing the quality of patents is **dubious**. DPMA and EPO issue two different documents:

1. DE xxxx **A**n and EP xxxx **A**n are revelation docs, which are found neither at CIPO nor at USPTO, and
2. DE xxxx **C**n and EP xxxx **B**n are patent docs, similar to CA and US ones.

D20: Having read Monages', Tame's drawbacks and others, all of which are Mrs. Draper's references cited, Mr. Gruber, CIPO's examiner, issued a verdict in contradiction to your claim rejections and "excellent" opinion. See attached [CIPO].

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

D21: I would greatly appreciate you, Mr. Dunn, if you would not treat me as a **silly beginner**[1], but give me assistance and take into account

a) my profound know-how thanks to the examiners of DPMA, EPO and CIPO willing to teach me, in particular, at their respective offices, give me assistance and send me their amendments plus explanations and

b) a large number of my patent documents such as:

CA 2,249,667, CA 2,313,780, CA 2,220,872, CA 2,236,816, CA 2,230,721, CA 2,257,079
EP 0844939 B1, EP 0869 878 B1, EP 1 178 915 B9, EP 1 037 773 B1, EP 1 037 771 B1, EP 1147 029 B1
DE 196 15 985 C1, DE 196 36 167 C1, DE 197 11 392 C1, DE 195 49 378 C2, DE 196 55 051 C2, DE 196 55 146 C2, DE 195 49 379 C2, DE 197 49 780 C2, DE 197 58 497 C2, DE 197 58 498 C2, DE 100 10 415 C1

CA 2,249,667 and CA 2,313,780 are not yet printed.

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

In compliance with (E2) the claims 14 to 18 of (E1) are rewritten into claims 21 to 25.
Figs. 12 to 24 and Claims 17-24 of (E3) are removed. **No** new matter is added. The total number of claims, already paid, remains the same at 26.
According to USPTO's flyer Rev. 3 (07/24/03) added and deleted text must be shown by underlining and strikethrough. Why has USPTO changed this new procedure *again* into the old one, underlining and but double bracket? How can I know it?

Thank you for your help and attention in advance.

Kind regards

Go Gogiokojen

Attached.
21-page substitute application in double space (300305)
6-page marked-up Claims of 10/690,742 (300405 >300305)
[NTSB, FAA], [USDP] U.S. Department of Transportation
[CIPO] CIPO' examination report,
[Economist] The Economist Nov. 8, 2003
"U040205" AUDI A2 % Opel Zafira

[1] In contrast, Jane F. Garvey, Chairperson of FAA, John Hammerschmidt, Chairman of NTSB, etc. have a different opinion on my work and patents [NTSB, FAA]. I've already met Sir Nick Scheele, President of Ford Corp at that time. Etc.